
**DCSS P3 PROJECT
TRAINING WORKGROUP
SEPTEMBER 21, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Thursday, September 21, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Training Workgroup held its sixth official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Doris Keller, State Co-Leader (DCSS Training Unit)
- ☐ Debra Paddack, County Co-Leader (Analyst---Sonoma)
- ☐ Ann Love, State Analyst (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Pamela Korman, County Analyst (Manager---San Bernadino)
- ☒ Sharon Quinn, Small County Rep (Senior DDA---Placer)
- ☒ Mary Leibham, Medium County Rep (Manager---Stanislaus)
- ☒ James Martinez, Large County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Fresno)
- ☒ Nora O'Brien, Advocate (Director, ACES)
- ☐ Gloria Clemons-White, DCSS, Training Unit
- ☐ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☐ Michael Wright, Judicial Council Rep (Senior Attorney---AOC)
- ☐ Louise Bayles-Fightmaster, Judicial Council (Sonoma County Specialist)
- ☐ Ed Kent, FTB Rep (Child Support Specialista)
- ☐ Stan Dettner, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Peter Dosh, FTB Rep (Supervisor ---Child Support Collections Program)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☐ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Kathie LaLonde, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov.

Michael Wright, Louise Bayles-Fightmaster, and Julie Hopkins were not available for the meeting due to their attendance at and participation in the AB 1058 Judicial Training Conference.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

The group reviewed the work they had done thus far on the draft report.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

- Discuss Workgroup Report
- Revise/Complete Report
- Brainstorm Next Steps

D. FINAL REPORT DRAFT

The bulk of the work session was spent in discussion about the content of the report. It was determined that the report should include goals and objectives, both long- and short-term. We will need to identify what the ongoing training steering committee can do and what the group can do. There is some duplication in the report that will need to be merged and/or cleaned up. The group agreed that we needed to improve the quality of the writing and the quantity of material provided in the report. By the end of the session, the group had produced a draft report for submission to the Workgroup facilitators.

E. BRAINSTORM NEXT STEPS

The group discussed the "Next Steps" portion of the report, and brainstormed recommendations in this area. Six items were identified as actions that should be taken expeditiously, as they could have significant impact on the California child support program.

1. Develop Strategic Training Plan
2. Conduct a needs assessment
3. Inventory and assess existing training programs statewide
4. Develop uniform curricula
5. Create task force, advisory group, or new workgroup
6. Study feasibility of certification of FSOs and other job classifications, including MCLE for attorneys

Other items of discussion included a potential recommendation for a budget increase related to training. Budget issues must be addressed during the drafting of the strategic plan, so that the plan can be carried out.

F. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES

None identified.

G. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

None identified.

H. HANDOUTS

Draft Final Workgroup Report.

I. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

See attached listing.

J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

None.

K. ATTACHMENTS

Action Item List.